

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are all the claims pending in the application.

Applicant notes that the Examiner has not initialed all the references listed on the PTO Form 1449 submitted on July 12, 2005. Specifically, the Examiner has not initialed the Haverstock et al. reference cited on the PTO Form 1449. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to initial all of the references, and return the PTO Form 1449 in the next USPTO communication.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Negishi et al. (US Patent App. No. US 2002/0116407, hereinafter "Negishi"), in view of Suzuki (US Patent No. 7,173,730). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“[a] network data-transfer method of transferring data from a server on a network to a network-connected equipment wherein the network-connected equipment which does not have a user interface performs a processing, the network data-transfer method comprising:

relaying an access from a client to the server for the network-connected equipment to perform the processing;

creating a transfer-data to be transferred to the client as a response to the access to the server at the relaying, wherein the transfer-data includes a processing data for the network-connected equipment; and

a transfer-data processing by the network-connected equipment, the transfer-data processing including acquiring the transfer-data created at the creating of the transfer data, extracting the processing data from the transfer-data, and performing a processing on the extracted processing data.”

The Negishi reference is directed to a portable terminal conversion system having a client, a relay server, and a document server. A document is sent from the document server to the relay server in response to a document request from a client. A script is then extracted from the document and is separately stored in a script cache. Then, a script calling portion in the document is substituted with a portion for calling the script stored in the script cache. The resulting document is then sent to the client. *See* Negishi, Abstract.

As a preliminary matter, the Examiner asserts that figure 1 of Negishi discloses relaying an access from a client (unit 10) to the server (unit 20, unit 30). *See* Office Action, page 3. However, claim 1 recites “relaying an access from a client to the server for the network-connected equipment to perform the processing.” The Examiner has not cited any aspect of Negishi for teaching the claimed network-connected equipment. Most likely since Negishi does not teach a network-connected equipment **wherein the network-connected equipment does not have a user interface**, let alone the transferring of data from a server on a network to a network-connected equipment. For at least this reason, the Examiner’s rejection is deficient.

In the Office Action the Examiner asserts that Negishi teaches the claimed feature of “creating a transfer-data to be transferred to the client as a response to the access to the server at the relaying.” The rejection is based on paragraph [0006] of Negishi. *See* Office Action, page 3. This portion of Negishi describes the communication between clients requesting documents from a server using HTTP and a corresponding URL over the world wide web (WWW). In response to the client request, the document server extracts the requested document from storage, or dynamically creates the corresponding document, and sends it to the client as an HTTP response. *See* Negishi, paragraph [0006].

However, Negishi neither teaches nor suggests creating a transfer-data to be transferred to the client as a response to the access to the server at the relaying. Rather, Negishi discloses that the client connects to the document server via the relay server, and the relay server converts a document received from the document server. See Negishi, paragraph [0060]. Indeed, Negishi neither teaches nor suggests creating a transfer-data to be transferred to the client as a response to the access to the server at the relaying. Negishi merely discloses that clients communicate with a document server, with no teaching or suggestion of creating a transfer-data at a relaying. As a result, Negishi fails to disclose the claimed feature of creating a transfer-data to be transferred to the client as a response to the access to the server at the relaying.

Further, Negishi neither teaches nor suggests the feature of “wherein the transfer-data includes a processing data for the network-connected equipment.” Rather, Negishi discloses that even a client who is not provided with a script operating environment can carry out the script by interpreting the script in a document transferred from the relay server. See Negishi, paragraph [0075]. This has the effect that the relay server merely interprets any script in the data requested from a client, but not a script in the data which is needed for the server itself and padded beforehand. Negishi neither teaches nor suggests the transfer-data includes a processing data for the network-connected equipment, or in other words the specific data for the network-connected equipment is padded in a transfer-data, as Negishi discloses nothing about transfer-data required for processing by of the relay server. Rather, Negishi merely discloses that the relay server extracts a script in a tag, with no teaching or suggestion that commands sent to the relay server include processing data required for the operation of the relay server.

In addition, the Examiner asserts that Negishi discloses the claimed feature of a transfer-data processing by the network-connected equipment, the transfer-data processing including acquiring the transfer-data created at the creating of the transfer data, extracting the processing data from the transfer-data, and performing a processing on the extracted processing data. The rejection is based on paragraph [0006] and figure 2 of Negishi. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the document server extracts the requested document form the stored document and performs a processing on the extracted processing data by returning a document. *See* Office Action, page 3.

However, Negishi neither teaches nor suggests of a transfer-data processing by the network-connected equipment, the transfer-data processing including acquiring the transfer-data created at the creating of the transfer data. As discussed above, claim 1 requires that the transfer-data is created at the time of relaying, and hence the transfer-data processing including acquiring the transfer-data created at the creating of the transfer data includes processing a transfer-data created at the time of relaying. However, Negishi merely discloses that the stored document is extracted after the relaying. Therefore, Negishi neither teaches nor suggests acquiring the transfer-data created at the creating of the transfer data, as Negishi discloses nothing about acquiring data that was created at the creating of the transfer data.

As a result, Negishi fails to disclose the claimed feature of a transfer-data processing by the network-connected equipment, the transfer-data processing including acquiring the transfer-data created at the creating of the transfer data, extracting the processing data from the transfer-data, and performing a processing on the extracted processing data.

Suzuki also fails to disclose the claimed features discussed above. Accordingly, the combination of Negishi and Suzuki fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1, and hence the combination of Negishi and Suzuki does not render claim 1 unpatentable.

In the Office Action the Examiner asserts that Negishi substantially discloses all the limitations of claim 1, but concedes that Negishi fails to disclose the claimed feature of “wherein the transfer-data includes a processing data for the network-connected equipment.” However, the Office Action asserts that Suzuki allegedly cures the deficient disclosures of Negishi. The rejection is based on column 1, lines 63 to 64 of Suzuki. That portion of Suzuki states that the “Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) allows a user to print to remote printers across the Internet or an intranet.”

However, that portion of Suzuki neither teaches nor suggests wherein the transfer-data includes a processing data for the network-connected equipment. Rather, that portion of Suzuki merely describes that an Internet protocol is being developed that enables users to print to remote printers across a network. That portion of Suzuki neither teaches nor suggests the transfer-data includes a processing data for the network-connected equipment, as that portion of Suzuki discloses nothing about a transfer-data including processing data. Rather, it merely asserts that a network printing protocol is being developed.

Therefore, Suzuki fails to disclose the claimed feature of wherein the transfer-data includes a processing data for the network-connected equipment, and hence Suzuki fails to cure the deficient disclosures of Negishi. Accordingly, the combination of Negishi and Suzuki does not render claim 1 unpatentable.

Claim 2

Claim 2 recites, *inter alia*:

“[the] network data-transfer method according to claim 1, wherein the creating includes putting, when the server transfers markup language format data to the network-connected equipment as a response to the access, a predetermined special-character string for identification indicating a data area where processing-data to be processed by the network-connected equipment is described in a comment portion in a comment tag of the markup language format data;

and putting the processing-data in a data area indicated by the special-character string for identification.”

In the Office Action the Examiner asserts that Negishi teaches wherein the creating includes putting, when the server transfers markup language format data to the network-connected equipment as a response to the access, a predetermined special-character string for identification indicating a data area where processing-data to be processed by the network-connected equipment is described in a comment portion in a comment tag of the markup language format data. The rejection is based on figures 2 and 3, and paragraph [0069] of Negishi. These portions of Negishi describe that a script calling portion is substituted with a script calling portion with an A (Anchor) tag for calling the script stored in the relay server.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that the anchor tag of Negishi does not teach a comment tag as would be apparent to one of skill in the art. Negishi neither teaches nor suggests a predetermined special-character string for identification indicating a data area where processing-data to be processed by the network-connected equipment is described in a comment portion in a comment tag of the markup language format data. Rather, Negishi discloses that the A tag designates the URI as the href attribute so as to link, or anchor, to WWW resources. Negishi neither teaches nor suggests a predetermined special character string described in a

comment portion in a comment tag of the markup language format data, as Negishi discloses nothing about a comment portion in a comment tag. Rather, it merely discloses that the A tag is used to link to WWW resources, with no teaching or suggestion of a comment tag.

Therefore, the combination of Negishi and Suzuki fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 2, and hence the combination of Negishi and Suzuki does not render claim 2 unpatentable.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-11 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully holds the rewriting of claims 3-11 in abeyance until the arguments presented with respect to claims 1 and 2 have been considered.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruthleen E. Uy/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

Date: February 5, 2008